UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
V.)	NO. 2:06-CR-168
)	
MATTHEW HENSLEY)	

COURT'S JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Dated: July 12, 2007

<u>s/ Philip P. Simon</u>

Philip P. Simon, Judge

United States District Court

Members of the jury, you have seen and heard all the evidence and the arguments of the attorneys. Now I will instruct you on the law.

You have two duties as a jury. Your first duty is to decide the facts from the evidence in the case. This is your job, and yours alone.

Your second duty is to apply the law that I give you to the facts. You must follow these instructions, even if you disagree with them. Each of the instructions is important, and you must follow all of them.

Perform these duties fairly and impartially. Do not allow sympathy, prejudice, fear, or public opinion to influence you. You should not be influenced by any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry, or sex.

Nothing I say now, and nothing I said or did during the trial, is meant to indicate any opinion on my part about what the facts are or about what your verdict should be.

The evidence consists of the testimony of the witnesses and the exhibits admitted in evidence. A stipulation is an agreement between both sides that certain facts are true.

You are to decide whether the testimony of each of the witnesses is truthful and accurate, in part, in whole, or not at all, as well as what weight, if any, you give the testimony of each witness.

In evaluating the testimony of any witness, you may consider, among other things:

- -the witness's age;
- the witness's intelligence;
- the ability and opportunity the witness had to see, hear, or know the things that the witness testified about;
 - the witness's memory;
 - any interest, bias, or prejudice the witness may have;
 - the manner of the witness while testifying; and
 - the reasonableness of the witness's testimony in light of all the evidence in the case.

You should use common sense in weighing the evidence and consider the evidence in light of your own observations in life.

In our lives, we often look at one fact and conclude from it that another fact exists. In law we call this "inference." A jury is allowed to make reasonable inferences. Any inferences you make must be reasonable and must be based on the evidence in the case.

Some of you have heard the phrases "circumstantial evidence" and "direct evidence." Direct evidence is the testimony of someone who claims to have personal knowledge of the commission of the crime which has been charged, such as an eyewitness. Circumstantial evidence is the proof of a series of facts which tend to show whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. The law makes no distinction between the weight to be given either direct or circumstantial evidence. You should decide how much weight to give to any evidence. All the evidence in the case, including the circumstantial evidence, should be considered by you in reaching your verdict.

Certain things are not evidence. I will list them for you:

First, testimony that I struck from the record, or that I told you to disregard, is not evidence and must not be considered.

Second, anything that you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be entirely disregarded. This includes any press, radio, or television reports you may have seen or heard. Such reports are not evidence and your verdict must not be influenced in any way by such publicity.

Third, questions and objections by the lawyers are not evidence. Attorneys have a duty to object when they believe a question is improper. You should not be influenced by any objection or by my ruling on it.

Fourth, the lawyers' statements to you are not evidence. The purpose of these statements is to discuss the issues and the evidence. If the evidence as you remember it differs from what the lawyers said, your memory is what counts.

It is proper for an attorney to interview any witness in preparation for trial.

You may find the testimony of one witness or a few witnesses more persuasive than the testimony of a larger number. You need not accept the testimony of the larger number of witnesses.

The indictment in this case is the formal method of accusing the defendant of an offense and placing the defendant on trial. It is not evidence against the defendant and does not create any inference of guilt.

The defendant is charged with attempting to use a facility or means of interstate commerce, specifically the World Wide Web, to knowingly persuade, induce, entice, or coerce an individual whom the defendant believed to be a minor child, to engage in any sexual activity for which a person can be charged with a criminal offense under Indiana law.

The defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charge.

The defendant is presumed to be innocent of the charge. This presumption continues during every stage of the trial and your deliberations on the verdict. It is not overcome unless from all the evidence in the case you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty as charged. The government has the burden of proving the guilt of the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt.

This burden of proof stays with the government throughout the case. The defendant is never required to prove his innocence or to produce any evidence at all.

The defendant has an absolute right not to testify. The fact that the defendant did not testify should not be considered by you in any way in arriving at your verdict.

COURT'S PROPOSED INSTRUCTION NO. 12

You have received evidence of a statement said to be made by the defendant to various individuals. You must decide whether the defendant did in fact make the statements. If you find that the defendant did make the statements, then you must decide what weight, if any, you feel the statement deserves. In making this decision, you should consider all matters in evidence having to do with the statement, including those concerning the defendant himself and the circumstances under which the statement was made.

You have heard evidence from Tiffany Gaede and transcripts of chats under the screen name "Nipsco26" which are acts of the defendant other than those charged in the indictment. You may consider the Tiffany Geade evidence only on the question of the defendant's knowledge and intent. You may consider the transcripts of the chats under the screen name "Nipsco26" only on the question of defendant's knowledge, intent, and plan. You should consider this evidence only for this limited purpose.

You have heard a witness give opinions about matters requiring special knowledge or skill. You should judge this testimony in the same way that you judge the testimony of any other witness. The fact that such a person has given an opinion does not mean that you are required to accept it. Give the testimony whatever weight you think it deserves, considering the reasons given for the opinion, the witness' qualifications, and all of the other evidence in the case.

You have heard recorded conversations. These recorded conversations are proper evidence and you may consider them, just as any other evidence.

When the recordings were played during the trial, you were furnished transcripts of the recorded conversations.

The recordings are the evidence, and the transcripts were provided to you only as a guide to help you follow as you listen to the recordings. The transcripts are not evidence of what was actually said or who said it. It is up to you to decide whether the transcripts correctly reflect what was said and who said it. If you noticed any difference between what you heard on the recordings and what you read in the transcripts, you must rely on what you heard, not what you read. And if after careful listening, you could not hear or understand certain parts of the recordings, you must ignore the transcripts as far as those parts are concerned.

The defendant is charged in Count One of the indictment with violations of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2422(b), which states:

Whoever, using any facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly attempts to persuade, induce, entice, or coerce a minor child to engage in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense, violates this section.

To sustain the charge in Count One of the indictment, the government must prove the following propositions:

First: The defendant used a facility of interstate commerce;

Second: In an attempt;

Third: To knowingly persuade, induce, entice, or coerce a minor child;

Fourth: To engage in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense.

If you find from your consideration of all of the evidence that any of these propositions has not been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty of that charge.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all of the evidence that each of these propositions has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty of that charge.

When the word "knowingly" is used in these instructions, it means that the defendant realized what he was doing and was aware of the nature of his conduct, and did not act through ignorance, mistake or accident.

Knowledge may be proved by the defendant's conduct, and by all the facts and circumstances surrounding the case.

You may infer knowledge from a combination of suspicion and indifference to the truth. If you find that a person had a strong suspicion that things were not what they seemed or that someone had withheld some important facts, yet shut his eyes for fear of what he would learn, you may conclude that he acted knowingly, as I have used that word. You may not conclude that the defendant had knowledge if he was merely negligent in not discovering the truth.

As used in Title 18, United States Code, Section 2422(b), the phrase "to engage in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense," means that the act or conduct attempted by the defendant must have been in violation of some state or federal law. In this case, the government has alleged that the defendant's conduct was a criminal offense under the laws of the State of Indiana.

Specifically, the government has alleged that the defendant's conduct constituted Child Solicitation in violation of Indiana Criminal Code IC 35-42-4-6 and Vicarious Sexual Gratification in violation of Indiana Criminal Code IC 35-42-4-5.

Indiana Criminal Code IC 35-42-4-6, entitled "Child Solicitation," was in full force and effect during the relevant time period.

This statute states, in part, as follows:

- (a) As used in this section, "solicit" means to command, authorize, urge, incite, request, or advise an individual by using a telephone or computer network to perform an act described in subsection (b).
- (b) A person eighteen (18) years of age or older who knowingly or intentionally solicits a child under fourteen (14) years of age, or an individual the person believes to be a child under fourteen (14) years of age, to engage in:
 - (1) sexual intercourse;
 - (2) deviate sexual conduct; or
 - (3) any fondling or touching intended to arouse or satisfy the sexual desires of either the child or the older person;

commits child solicitation.

Indiana Criminal Code IC 35-42-4-5, entitled "Vicarious Sexual Gratification" was in full force and effect during the relevant time period.

This statute states, in part, as follows:

A person eighteen (18) years of age or older who knowingly or intentionally directs, aids, induces, or causes a child under the age of sixteen (16) to touch or fondle himself with intent to arouse or satisfy the sexual desires of a child or the older person commits vicarious sexual gratification.

To "attempt" means that the defendant knowingly took a substantial step toward the commission of the offense with the intent to commit that offense.

A "substantial step" must be something more than mere preparation, but less than the last act necessary before the actual commission of the intended crime.

It is not a defense that the person with whom the defendant communicated was not in fact an actual minor, but rather an adult posing as a minor.

The Internet is a facility of interstate commerce.

Under Title 18, United States Code, § 2422(b), it is not necessary for the government to prove that the defendant traveled to meet an actual minor or an adult posing as a minor.

The indictment charges that the offense was committed "between on or about" August 7, 2006 "through on or about" August 19, 2006. The government must prove that the alleged offense happened reasonably close to the time period between those dates but is not required to prove that the alleged offense happened between those exact dates.

Upon retiring to the jury room, select one of your number as your foreperson. The foreperson will preside over your deliberations and will be your representative here in court.

Forms of verdict have been prepared for you.

Take these forms to the jury room, and when you have reached unanimous agreement on the verdict, your foreperson will fill in and date the appropriate form, and each of you will sign it.

I do not anticipate that you will need to communicate with me. If you do, however, the only proper way is in writing, signed by the foreperson, or if he or she is unwilling to do so, by some other juror, and given to the marshal.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Your verdict, whether it be guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous.

You should make every reasonable effort to reach a verdict. In doing so, you should consult with one another, express your own views, and listen to the opinions of your fellow jurors. Discuss your differences with an open mind. Do not hesitate to re-examine your own views and change your opinion if you come to believe it is wrong. But you should not surrender your honest beliefs about the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or for the purpose of returning a unanimous verdict.

The twelve of you should give fair and equal consideration to all the evidence and deliberate with the goal of reaching an agreement which is consistent with the individual judgment of each juror.

You are impartial judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to determine whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.